

**PROJECT MANAGER'S QUALITY CHECKLIST OF PROPOSALS
(Prior to PCIEERD Management Team (PMT) Deliberation)**

Proponent/Project Leader : _____
 Agency : _____
 Project Proposal Title : _____
 : _____
 Address : _____
 Contact No. : _____
 Email : _____

	YES	NO
1. Was the proposal endorsed by the head of the agency?	_____	_____
2. Is the proposal aligned with the scope of the Call for Proposal? <input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____
3. Does the proposal contain the following required components?		
a. Cooperating Agency/ies (Check for commitment letter/s)	_____	_____
b. Project Duration	_____	_____
c. Site of Implementation	_____	_____
d. Rationale/Significance	_____	_____
e. Objectives (General and Specific)	_____	_____
f. Description	_____	_____
g. Review of Related Literature/Literature Cited	_____	_____
h. Scientific Basis/Theoretical/Conceptual Framework	_____	_____
i. Methodology/Strategies of Implementation	_____	_____
j. Major Activities/Workplan/Gantt Chart	_____	_____
k. Expected Outputs (6 Ps output)	_____	_____
l. Expected Outcomes	_____	_____
m. Target Beneficiaries	_____	_____
n. Perceived Impact	_____	_____
o. Sectoral Concern	_____	_____
p. Personnel Requirements	_____	_____
q. Line-Item Budget	_____	_____
4. Does the proposal have information about the Proponent/Project Team? (Check for curriculum vitae) and Organization? (Check for Institution's Track Record)	_____	_____
5. Did the proposal pass the GAD score?	_____	_____
6. Has the proposal been conducted before by other local researcher/s? (Check for duplication of research)	_____	_____

Remarks:

PM Comments and Recommendations:

Prepared by:

Noted by:

Senior SRS, Project Manager

Division Chief

GUIDE: Interpretation of the GAD score

0 - 3.9 GAD is invisible in the project (proposal is returned).

4.0 - 7.9 Proposed project has promising GAD prospects (proposal earns a "conditional pass," pending identification of gender issues and strategies and activities to address these and inclusion of the collection of sex-disaggregated data in the monitoring and evaluation plan).

8.0 - 14.9 Proposed project is gender-sensitive (proposal passes the GAD test)

15.0 - 20.0 Proposed project is gender-responsive (proponent is commended).

Technical Panel Evaluation Criteria and Indicators

Title of Project Proposal

Name of Project Leader

Institution

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Ave. Score	Weighted Score	Justification
1. Scientific Merit (30%)	Contribution to the advancement of knowledge and understanding in the field of Science and Technology	5	5.00	1.50	
	The research is at par with the existing studies; cutting edge; world class research	5			
	Sound scientific basis to generate new knowledge / innovate technology	5			
	Will contribute to the	5			
2. Methodology (30%)	The procedures are clear, well-organized, well-described and based on a sound rationale.	5	5.00	1.50	
	The proposed methods and results are valid, replicable and reliable	5			
	The proposed activities are reasonable to attain its expected outputs	5			

3. Financial Soundness (15%)	The proposed budget is reasonable in the conduct of the research. Expense items sought are appropriate and necessary	5	5.00	0.75	
	There are adequate counterpart resources available (e.g. expertise, facilities) to carry out the research.	5			
4. Timeframe (15%)	The duration of the project and its activities are reasonable.	5	5.00	0.75	
	The workplan is doable in a given timeframe.	5			
	The risk management plan was established to avoid delays in the project implementation.	5			
5. Other Issues (10%)	Compliance to regulatory requirements necessary in the conduct of research	5	5.00	0.50	
	Ethical issues (i.e do not harm, informed consent, voluntary participation, privacy, anonymity, confidentiality) are properly addressed	5			
Total Score			5.00	5.00	

Disposition

Points	Disposition
>=4.5 to 5.0	Highly Recommended
>=3.1 to <4.4	Recommended (subject to compliance from PMT Comments)
>=2.1 to <3.0	For Revision (subject for PMT Re-evaluation)
0.0 to <2.0	Not Recommended

PCIEERD Management Team (PMT) Evaluation Criteria, Indicators and Guide Questions

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	GUIDE QUESTION	TRUE / YES / AGREE	FALSE / NO / DISAGREE	CRITERIA RAW SCORE	AVERAGE SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	REMARKS
1. Socio-Economic Impact (35%)	1.1 Potential of project to create/provide/generate employment.	1.1.1 Identifies the specific jobs/skillsets to be involved	x		5	5.00	1.75	
		1.1.2 Estimates the number of personnel needed in the new industry/sector	x					
		1.1.3 Directly generates new employment/jobs after its completion	x					
		1.1.4 Projects leads to new skills sets that will be deployable/in demand	x					
		1.1.5 Need for skillsets will persist long after project implementation period	x					
	1.2 Potential to Increase income and productivity	1.2.1 Identifies the business or industry where the R&D results will be applied	x		5			
		1.2.2 Increases the level of productivity of beneficiary organization	x					
		1.2.3 The level of increase in productivity is quantified	x					
		1.2.4 Increase in income of firms or industries is shown	x					
		1.2.5 Level of increase of income is quantified and reasonable	x					
	1.3 Ability to address any current/pressing national problem, among others, are specified and quantified	1.3.1 Identifies and scopes the specific issue or problems	x		5			
		1.3.2 The scope of the problem is national	x					
		1.3.3 The nature of the problem is urgent	x					
		1.3.4 The extent or level of the problem addressed is properly quantified	x	x				
		1.3.5 The whole extent or scope of problem is addressed	x	x				
2. Environmental Impact (10%)	2.1 The project will not pose a significant adverse effect on the environment and/or public health	2.1.1 the place of implementation has no environment issue	x		5			
		2.1.2 ... will lead to new technologies that is environmentally-neutral (no net emission or pollution)	x					
		2.1.3 ... will not generate possible new environmental problems in the area	x					
		2.1.4 ... is acceptable to the community where it is going to be implemented	x					
		2.1.5 ... will sustainably utilise (natural) resources that could potentially be depleted in the long-term	x					
								5.00

PCIEERD Management Team (PMT) Evaluation Criteria, Indicators and Guide Questions

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	GUIDE QUESTION	TRUE / YES / AGREE	FALSE / NO / DISAGREE	CRITERIA RAW SCORE	AVERAGE SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	REMARKS
	2.2 Will improve environmental conditions using environment-friendly /clean process	2.2.1 Identifies environmental challenges in the technology/process current being used	x		5	5.00	0.50	
		2.2.2 Intends to develop technologies that directly improve environment conditions of specific areas or industries	x					
		2.2.3 Mitigates the environmental effects (wastes, emissions) where the processes is being applied	x					
		2.2.4 Quantifies the potential solution and effectiveness to the specific problem	x					
		2.2.5 Solution is applicable or robust enough to be applicable to other areas or situations	x					
3. Plans for Research / Project Results Utilization (30%)	3.1 Plans on how R&D results will be used by the prospective end user/s or adopters are defined	3.1.1 The resulting products and technologies clearly identified	x		5	5.00	1.50	
		3.1.2 Is/Are the prospective user/s clearly identified	x					
		3.1.3 There is a clear plan to turn over the result or technology	x					
		3.1.4 The need for the technology by the prospective user is clearly established	x					
		3.1.5 The resulting products and technology is suitable and acceptable to end-users	x					
	3.2 Addresses strategic needs/value	3.2.1 Beyond current target uses, are there other potential uses of the products	x		5			
		3.2.2 Beyond current target end-users, are there other prospective users?	x					
		3.2.3 Shows how the project results can be scaled up to be widely used or available	x					
		3.2.4 The results add value to the research organization and builds on previous research	x					
		3.2.5 Is the technology developed versatile enough to be applicable to address research needs of other fields or disciplines?	x					
	3.3.Sustainability plan for the resources generated and capacity built from the project	3.3.1 Builds research capacity through equipment & laboratory establishment	x		5			
		3.3.2 Builds research capacity thorough human resource & training	x					
		3.3.3 Indicates how research fills in the sector roadmap	x					
		3.3.4 Includes training activities for stakeholders	x					

PCIEERD Management Team (PMT) Evaluation Criteria, Indicators and Guide Questions

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	GUIDE QUESTION	TRUE / YES / AGREE	FALSE / NO / DISAGREE	CRITERIA RAW SCORE	AVERAGE SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	REMARKS
		3.3.5 Has ability to attract interest from other organizations to support future activities	x					
4. Marketability (25%)	4.1 Determine current and potential market demand	4.1.1 The volume of products to be generated is identified and quantified in the proposal	x		5	5.00	1.25	
		4.1.2 There is currently an unmet demand	x					
		4.1.3 The technology ensures that rate of production matches or exceeds the demand	x					
		4.1.4 The market is expected to increase even after the project is completed and beyond	x					
		4.1.5 There is a government policy to support generation of the demand	x					
	4.2 Has identified specific/potential end-users	4.2.1 The target current end-users/customers are identified	x		5			
		4.2.2 The target end-users are quantified	x					
		4.2.3 Other potential users are also identified and quantified	x					
		4.2.4 Current set of end-users may increase in the future	x					
		4.2.5 Interest from end-users will not go away anytime soon	x					
	4.3 Explore/Create new markets for the resulting product/process/service are specified	4.3.1 Is there a new market identified for the product	x		5			
		4.3.2 Given the existing market and competition, the product can still thrive or succeed	x					
		4.3.3 The product is unique enough to generate its own market	x					
		4.3.4 Does the proposed product match the new identified market	x					
		4.3.5 There will be no future competitors	x					
	4.4 Advantage over existing products/services in the market	4.4.1 The competing/comparable products are identified	x		5			
		4.4.2 The target product/technology price is indicated/determined	x					
		4.4.3 The product/technology price is competitive	x					
		4.4.4 The advantageous features of the resulting product are clearly outlined/highlighted	x					

PCIEERD Management Team (PMT) Evaluation Criteria, Indicators and Guide Questions

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	GUIDE QUESTION	TRUE / YES / AGREE	FALSE / NO / DISAGREE	CRITERIA RAW SCORE	AVERAGE SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	REMARKS
		4.4.5 The advantages could outweigh the higher price for the same product (Answer "Yes" if actually lower)	x					
	4.5 Potential adoption/use of the industry (manufacturer) and other partners	4.5.1 Beneficiaries and interested groups are clearly identified;	x		5			
		4.5.2 The particular company/firms to adopt/license the technology is identified	x					
		4.5.3 There is a letter of commitment from one or more organization to adopt the technology if found to be suitable	x					
		4.5.4 There will be counterpart contribution or funding from a company indicated in the proposal	x					
		4.5.5 The proposal has a definite target company to license agreements	x					
EQUIVALENT POINTS							5.00	

PCIEERD Management Team (PMT) Evaluation Criteria, Indicators and Guide Questions

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	GUIDE QUESTION	TRUE / YES / AGREE	FALSE / NO / DISAGREE	CRITERIA RAW SCORE	AVERAGE SCORE	WEIGHTE D SCORE	REMARKS
----------	-----------	----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	------------------	-----------------------	---------

Disposition:

Points	Disposition
4.5 to 5.0	Highly Recommended
3.1 to 4.4	Recommended (subject to compliance from PMT Comments)
2.0 to 3.0	For Revision (subject for PMT Re-evaluation)
0.0 to 1.9	Not Recommended

Remarks (other comments):

Governing Council (GC) Evaluation Criteria and Indicators

RAW SCORE GUIDE	
5	Meets indicator fully and completely
4	Meets indicator with clarification needed
3	Meets indicator with minor revisions needed
2	Meets indicator with major revisions needed
0	Does not meet indicator

CRITERIA	INDICATORS	RAW SCORE	PERCENT SCORE
A. Soundness of Proposal (20%)	R&D addresses relevant sectoral need (applicable to pressing concern)	5	20
	Solution provided is most effective (compared to other proposed solutions)	5	
	Proposed budget is reasonable (project is not expensive vis-a-vis output)	5	
	Workplan is doable in a given timeframe	5	
B. Suitability of Output (30%)	R&D output is cost-effective (cost is competitive in relation to new or existing products or process)	5	30
	Has identified partners to adopt the technology (with letter of support from the head of the company)	5	
	Output can be commercialized (through an existing manufacturer, spin-off or start-up company)	5	
	R&D utilization is timely (output should not be overtaken by others)	5	
C. Significance of Outcome (30%)	Economic: (1) increase in productivity, (2) increase in income, (3) new jobs generated, (4) high ROI	5	30
	Social: (1) working partnerships established, (2) trainings opportunities provided, (3) policies adopted, (4) increased access to basic services (i.e., food, health, education)	5	
	Environment: (1) enhanced environment health standards, (2) no adverse effect	5	
	Sustainability: Sustainability mechanisms established in terms institutional, financial and human resources capability (does not include serial submission of new related proposal)	5	
D. Competence of Proponent (20%)	Proponent's expertise aligned with the proposal	5	20
	Collaboration with relevant agencies and/or industry partners	5	
	Thorough understanding of the proposal's deliverables	5	
	Have good experience with the proponent	5	
		TOTAL SCORE	100

PERCENT SCORE	DISPOSITION
80 - 100	Highly Recommended
61 - 80	Recommended (subject to compliance from GC comments)
41 - 60	For Revision (subject forPMT/GC Re-evaluation)
0 - 40	Not Recommended